

Remarks/Arguments:

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claims 51 and 55 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Examiner states that claims 51 and 55 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 28, 48, 49, 52-54 and 56-57 as being unpatentable over Nakayama (USPN 6,339,774) in view of Petras (USPN 7,143,089). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants have amended independent claims 48 and 28. Specifically, Applicants have included the limitations of allowable dependent claim 51 in currently amended claim 48. The Applicants have also included the limitations of allowable dependent claim 55 in currently amended claim 28. Therefore, claims 48 and 28 are in condition for allowance due to the added limitations of allowable claims 51 and 55 respectively.

Claims 49 and 52 include all the features of claim 48 from which they depend. Thus, claims 49 and 52 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 53, 54 and 56-74 include all the features of claim 28 from which they depend. Thus, claims 53, 54 and 56-74 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Application No.: 09/851,791
Amendment Dated: November 27, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: August 27, 2007

MTS-3257US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above identified application is in the condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717
Attorney for Applicants

RAE/rae/dmw/fp

Dated: November 27, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

MJC_193899_1